FELLOWSHIP

November 1943 — Vol. IX—No. 11

Andover Newton Theological Library
OCT 13 1945
NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.

This is [England's] thirteenth war with a Continental Power since the Spanish Armada. Only two have ended with a clear-cut victory and those were the two that left us most exhausted. The agreed peace of negotiation which ended the other eleven was more satisfactory than the dictated peace of 1919.

CAPTAIN LIDDELL HART,
British Military Expert.

Twenty-Five Years After—

by

A. J. MUSTE

•

The Devils and the Fools by Francis Hall

They Asked for a Hard Job by Frank Olmstead

•

Three Pages of Peace News

15 cents a copy $1.50 a Year

FROM MY STANDPOINT

John Haynes Holmes

Nothing so angers the people who are behind this war as talk about a "negotiated peace." It would seem as though any talk about bringing the war to an end would be welcome. It's a strange world in which the discussion of peace is anathema! But there is something about this idea of negotiating with our enemies which stirs the deepest depths of venom in the non-pacifist. And this "something," I believe, is not far to seek. These belligerent brethren are not primarily concerned about peace. If they could end the war tomorrow on wholly just negotiated terms of peace, they would not do so. On the contrary, they would choose rather to keep the war going indefinitely—or until they had gotten what they desire more than peace.

I

The first thing they desire, obviously, is punishment, the more ferocious the better, inflicted upon our enemies. Punishment not merely of the leaders in Germany and Japan, but of the people of these countries—i.e., not merely of governments but of nations! Hitler, of course—this wretched man, they insist, must be seized, tried, tortured, and given at last a vengeful death! Then the rest of the Nazi gangsters must be dealt with—if possible executed upon the gibbet, or before a firing-squad. As for the Germans themselves, they must be ground to powder. Their industries taken from them, their armies disbanded, their territories dismembered, their children and children's children bowed down beneath burdens heavy and grievous to be borne! Thus will they be taught the madness of waging war against the world, and incidentally rendered forever incapable of doing so. Punishment of these beasts and criminals, that's what our opponents want! And if it means the indefinite continuance of the war, and the indefinite postponement of the peace to get it—then, so be it!

It is interesting to note that Stalin, whose country has suffered so terribly in the war, has ideas very different from those of the hate-mongers among us. The Soviet leader has assured the German people that, if they will get rid of the Nazi regime, he will negotiate a peace with them which will preserve their army, guarantee their territory, and maintain their independence and dignity as a state. Stalin evidently wants to end this war, and realizes that such an end assures a durable peace as advantageous for Russia as for Europe and the world at large. But our nation, apparently, must not be allowed to cherish such feeble notions as this. Punishment is the cry. And upon this the peace must wait.

II

But there is a second thing that our non-pacifists desire more than peace, and that is power. When this war is over, the world must be in the hands of the Allies, to do with as they will. And until the world is thus in our hands, the war is not going to be over. To this end of power, alliances are now in the making. Clearer and clearer it becomes that Anglo-American union is to dominate, after the victory is won, the entire Western world, and if possible the globe. To be sure, Russia may have something to say about this in the West, as China may have something to say about it in the East. But the plan none the less is plain—to make Britain and America dominant in the United Nations, and the United Nations dominant in the world at large. And if it takes a long and bloody war to achieve this goal of military and imperialistic power, then a long and bloody war is precisely what we shall have. Any talk of peace, until this power is in hand, is premature, we are told, and therefore traitorous. Hence the fierce and furious denunciation of anybody who suggests negotiation. For this might end the war too soon!

It is to be said, in all fairness, that the better spirits, if not the better minds, among those who demand the power-supremacy of Britain and America in the post-war world, sincerely believe that this is the only arrangement that can give us a real and lasting peace. The peace this time, they argue, must be enforced; and it can be enforced, and thus maintained, only by a predominance of power; and such power, dangerous always, can in this case be safely entrusted only to such enlightened nations as lead the Anglo-Saxon world. Than such thinking as this there can be nothing more fallacious! For the one thing that can't be enforced is peace. If peace is to endure, it must endure through its own inherent spiritual power, and not through any material or military power imposed from without.

If one would see this thesis set forth with abundant scholarship and authoritative conviction, let him turn to the January 1943 issue of the *American Journal of International Law,* and read therein the article by Professor Edwin Borchard, of Yale, on "The Place of Law and Courts in International Relations." Force, says Professor Borchard, is the one thing that cannot give us peace. No predominance of power can either establish or maintain it. "The attractions of organized force must be rigorously repudiated (in the international field), . . . otherwise, before the present catastrophe has wreaked all its desolation upon the human race, we stand on the brink of new disasters."

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*

R. ALFRED HASSLER
Managing Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Dorothy Detzer
Eugene Exman
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Amos B. Hulen
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Willis J. King
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Donovan E. Smucker
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

III

This is why all talk of a negotiated peace, or of "peace now," rouses such resentment at this hour. Deceived themselves, our belligerent friends would deceive others into believing that they want to bring peace out of this war. But what they really, or at least primarily, desire, is certain other things upon which they insist peace must be contingent. First among these desires is punishment of the enemy; second is power over the world. It is because negotiation may hasten a peace which will ignore punishment and forfeit power that it is howled down with the rage of a dog robbed of his bone.

All of which may shed a flood of light upon the question as to why, after all these centuries, we have not yet found peace! May it not be because we do not want peace? Or at least, at any particular time, want something else more than we want peace! Hence the lesson—that peace must be had *now,* or not at all.

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

November 1943 — Vol. IX—No. 11

Are all prison officials monsters? Are hunger-striking conscientious objectors behaving like children? Here is a sane appraisal of two groups of men who are variously thought of as —

The Devils and the Fools

By FRANCIS HALL

[*Editor's Note: The author of this article was one of the men who in October, 1940, first dramatized the stand against conscription by their refusal to register. Fran was sentenced to two years in prison, which he served in Danbury Correctional Institution. He was released in the spring of 1943, and worked during the past summer as a special field secretary for the FOR. On October 8 he was sentenced in Newark, New Jersey, to a second term of three years, which he is now serving in Ashland, Kentucky.*]

PACIFISTS do not have a common mind on all matters. Nowhere has this been more in evidence than in the reaction of pacifist individuals to the prison experience through which many conscientious objectors are passing.

At one extreme there are pacifists who paint federal prison officials virtually as devils, sadistic by nature, and filled with a malicious desire to take out all of their pent-up cruelty on imprisoned COs. At the other extreme stand those who have convinced themselves that all "absolutist" COs, who refuse to cooperate in prison, are fools. Fortunately, neither caricature is correct. Unfortunately, each of them has won many adherents.

The Case for the "Devils"

In the United States, as in Britain, pacifists during this war have found themselves treated with an unexpected tolerance, a situation that to many has been disappointing. As a result, there has been and is grave danger of the development among them of a persecution complex. It is not easy to witness to a cause when the opportunity to suffer for it is completely undercut, and there has been a tendency to magnify out of all proportion such incidents as give the appearance of martyrdom. Thus, stories coming out of the prisons that could be interpreted as instances of persecution have been greatly overemphasized, and have tended to develop a false perspective. Such an attitude is not consonant with the principle of Truth for which pacifists stand, and must be guarded against by all of us.

Prison officials in the federal system can be described, at the least, as sincerely humanitarian. The excellent history of prison reform contributed to by these men is sufficient evidence to substantiate such an assertion. Even since the last war penological thinking has made tremendous strides. The medieval theory of prison for punishment has been attacked militantly, and in its place has been substituted a theory of individual treatment with the aim of rehabilitation. This is completely in line with the Fourth Article of the Fellowship's Statement of Purpose. In the attempt to put the theory into practice, federal officials have engaged in an extensive plan of building and education. They would be the first to admit that they have not altogether succeeded in the ultimate aim of rehabilitation, but everyone else must admit that they have established a prison system that, in spite of its shortcomings, is one of the best in the world.

New buildings are now constructed with a sense of beauty, as well as of practicality. Clothing is quite presentable in any common society. Names are used instead of numbers. A considerable degree of cleanliness is maintained. Food generally is adequate, though not fancy. Excellent medical services are provided; a full-time educational director conducts a program of study; varied recreational and entertainment facilities are available; chaplains are on hand, and so on.

The prisons themselves are graded, varying from the maximum custody of Alcatraz to the extremely light custody of the work-camps. Most COs are to be found in the Correctional Institutions, next above the work-camps in the scale of custody, though many are in the work-camps themselves. Such a listing as this can only be the faintest sketch of actual conditions, but it is sufficient to show that modern federal prisons are not "the land of the living dead" that they once were.

The treatment of COs in the prisons generally, though not always, has testified to these humanitarian policies. At the Correctional Institution at Danbury, Connecticut, for example, officials have gone a long way in recognizing the consciences of the COs. Although there is defense work in the Institution, no pressure is brought on the COs to engage in it. On the contrary, at the time of work classification they are told of the existence of the defense jobs, and

are informed that if ever their work involves them in anything contrary to their consciences, they may bring the problem to the officials, and a work change will be granted if warranted.

That this policy actually operates is illustrated by an incident that occurred on the farm. At harvest-time there were more tomatoes than could be consumed in the dining-hall. One morning an army truck drove up and the workers, many of whom were COs, were told to load the excess crop into the truck. After finishing the morning's work, one of the COs told the Captain that he felt he could not do such work again. The response of the Captain was to give him a new job, and to call in other COs and ask them if they wanted a change also.

In spite of these conditions, COs often come into conflict with the prison officials, though practically never as a result of measures of persecution adopted by the officials. On the contrary, nearly all of conflict has been initiated directly by the COs. For instance, two and a half years ago, the whole group at Danbury went on a one-day work strike in observance of the National Student Anti-War Strike. The group was put on restrictions for a month. At another time some of the COs went on strike in sympathy with a group of regular inmates who were being punished. They asked to be put under the same conditions as the men being punished, and, when the request was granted, for the first time were given near-maximum punishment.

The case of Stanley Murphy and Louis Taylor has received the most attention along this line. While these men were still in Danbury, their non-violence was met non-violently, according to their own testimony. Prison officials overrode many normal regulations in attempting to find a solution to the problem. A committee of inmate COs was allowed to visit the two men. The doors were opened for national pacifist leaders to come in and see them. The parents of the two men were permitted in. Similar conditions prevail now in relation to the strikers at Danbury and Lewisburg. This is not to say that any of these actions were superogatory, but they were done. It would be unworthy of pacifists not to give what credit is due.

The Case for the "Fools"

Nevertheless, exactly as it is completely wrong to paint prison officials as devils, so it is completely wrong to paint the absolutist COs as fools and children. Even granting that these non-cooperators may make mistakes of judgment, there is no gainsaying that they act with the best light they have and with deep sincerity. No program of non-cooperation has been initiated except where there has been an actual problem, and then only after a period of intensive soul-searching.

The obvious reason for non-cooperation is the fact that, in spite of its advances, the prison system still is filled with evils. (Some COs feel that the whole system is evil by its very nature, and that the only valid reform would be to abolish it completely.) Punishment within the prisons is often harsh, and sometimes brutal. Race segregation is a school in racial superiority, and it can be nothing else so long as it exists, even though completely equal accommodations are provided for the minority races. The authoritarianism of the prisons is destructive of individual initiative, and opens the door for countless abuses. It is certain that in the "heavy custody" prisons such abuses at times take the form of beatings.

That statements made by officials always can be trusted is questionable. When there is a disagreement as to fact between reliable COs and the prison officials, there is good reason to believe the CO. This is amply revealed by the official denials of situations in relation to Murphy and Taylor and the subsequent withdrawal of those denials when investigations came up. A considerable amount of other evidence, not commonly known, substantiates this claim. It follows, therefore, that when Murphy says he was beaten, he undoubtedly was beaten. That Murphy and Taylor are reliable will be amply affirmed by the COs who met them in Danbury. It is a real tragedy that the sensible treatment accorded these men in Danbury was allowed to degenerate.

When a man enters prison as a result of his opposition to evil, and then finds evil there, it is a logical conclusion that his conscience will be stirred up again, and he may well feel called upon to take another stand. This is precisely what has happened. When men who believe in the brotherhood of man find themselves forced to live separately from those of other races, they are bound to be restive. When into that situation there comes a man of the other race who must eat in the kitchen because his own table is full, it is easy to see how some of the COs would feel that they too could not eat in the regular place. According to reports, such a story as this is behind the work-strikes in both Danbury and Lewisburg. The men involved have taken their action out of their conscientious convictions and in the hope that they might effect a breakdown in the walls of segregation.

In much the same way the problem of authoritarianism has been an important element in some of the non-cooperation. A belief in freedom and in democracy is fundamental to pacifism. When, therefore, pacifists go to prison and find themselves in an environment totally opposite to democracy, it is obvious again that the environment will not set well with them. When it becomes apparent to them that such authoritarianism is inimical to rehabilitation and leads to abuses, it is again but a short step to non-cooperation. Even to accuse such men of poor judgment for taking "extreme" action hardly becomes the pacifist, who himself is considered extreme by most of society; to consider them foolish and childish is completely unwarranted. On the contrary, they deserve all respect and support.

Neither Devils Nor Fools

The final picture we get, then, is one that balances. On the one hand there is a generally humanitarian situation with certain evils and abuses still existent within it. On the other hand there is a large body of COs, most of whom cooperate with the situation, but some of whom feel at times that the evils still existent are so flagrant that they cannot continue to cooperate, and so go on strike with the hope of altering conditions.

There are neither devils on the one hand, nor fools on the other. Pacifists who preach a doctrine of love must maintain that love in relation to the prison officials, but they must also maintain it in relation to the thousands of men incarcerated in the prison system. When the prison official is criticized unwarrantedly, the pacifist must stand up for him. And when the evil inherent in the prison system begins to work to the ill of the inmates, the pacifist must take his stand against that evil, though still in an attitude of love.

Twenty-Five Years After—

THE FELLOWSHIP'S CO-SECRETARY SURVEYS THE WORLD SCENE

By A. J. MUSTE

ON November 11 at eleven o'clock in the morning exactly a quarter of a century will have passed since multitudes in the United States and many other lands went delirious with joy because the Armistice had brought the World War to an end. It was not the mere cessation of bloody slaughter that caused such joy, though that certainly brought blessed relief to millions. Beyond this, there was the confident expectation that this had been the war to end war and that the world had indeed been made safe for democracy.

As a result of the disillusionment that followed that first Armistice Day, most people today entertain much more sober expectations concerning the outcome of World War II. Indeed, moderately informed and intelligent people do not need to have demonstrated to them that this is "just another war" and not a noble and successful crusade for democracy and brotherhood. They are quite aware of the strong probability that the war will not lead to a secure peace but will open up an era of suspicion, social upheaval, and further disintegration of the Western world. If this were all that was necessary to persuade Americans and others to stop fighting and start devising a radically new policy, the war would come to an abrupt end even as I write these words. Consider a few aspects of the current situation.

A War to Save Imperialism

The people of the United States are fighting once more to salvage the British Empire. Mr. Churchill has been utterly frank about that. India, in some of whose provinces people are dying of starvation by the thousands daily, and where Gandhi and Nehru remain in prison, is to remain within the sphere of British economic and political hegemony, albeit with some modification of the present status. Even British Labor Party leaders back Churchill at this point.

The Chinese ally has received no assurance that the British will relinquish their hold on Hong Kong. Furthermore, suggests Lin Yutang, China and the peoples of Asia are not to be permitted to liberate themselves. Britain and the United States will "rescue" them, Churchill promised last March, after the allies have disposed of Hitler in Europe. A "rescued" China would not be a leading victorious power with a full share in determining the peace. "In fact, there will be no 'leading' or 'great victorious power' in Asia at all at the end of the war, so that the nest of White Imperialism will be safe." The strategy of keeping Japan and China apart after the war, as they were kept apart before the war, is another element in the policy of Western imperialism.

If we are to be entirely realistic about November 1943, we must in turn remind Lin Yutang and the uncritical "friends" of China and of the Chiangs in this country, that the Nationalist Party and government in China are by no means free from reactionary and fascist tendencies. We must remind them further that a million or more of General Chiang's troops are not engaged in fighting the Japanese but in holding Chinese "Communist" armies in check, and that there is some question whether being friends of the present regime in China, actually is synonymous with being friends of the Chinese people.

In another section of the globe, asserts Pierre Van Paassen, "Great Britain is now preparing to turn the Arabian Peninsula and the African Continent into an exclusive sphere of interest. She does this for the reason that after the war the British Empire will have to shorten its lines," since the South American market and quite possibly also the Chinese will fall to the United States. Hence the appeasement of various Arab states, including Irak, which was an ally of Germany early in the war and which still operates frankly on a Nazi philosophy. The other side of that policy involves shutting down on access of the Jews to Palestine and preventing the growth of Jewish power in the near East. The long agony of the Jews is not at an end, and today, as in the past, the Nazis are not the only ones making a major contribution to it.

All this does not imply that United States policy is on a higher plane than British. We too are engaged in trying to maintain and extend our "national interests." We believe that this involves collaboration with Britain now and to some extent after the war, yet there are plenty of signs that this will not keep us from entering into vigorous economic warfare with Britain.

The passage of the Fulbright resolution in the House and recent declarations of various elements in the Republican Party make it clear that old-type isolationism is dead in the United States. We are preparing for a career of neo-imperialism. The five globe-girdling Senators have added their voices to the growing insistence that we must acquire military bases in all parts of the world. Latin America and the lands bordering on the Pacific are to be our sphere of influence, where we shall exercise economic and, so far as we deem necessary, political dominion.

Agitation for granting immediate independence to the Philippines must not deceive us, any more than Japanese moves to the same end. Walter Lippmann, more and more the expositor of the main drift of United States policy, recently gave the clue to the real meaning of such moves: "What earthly good is independence to the Philippines if the United States is incapable of defending them? . . . A Filipino who does not see that is not fit to govern an independent state." Furthermore, we must "make secure the whole region in which the islands lie"—China, the Netherlands Indies, Australia! We cannot do this "with not enough force to be invulnerable. If Bataan and Corregidor have not burned that lesson upon our minds, we are hard to teach when it comes to foreign affairs."

Both in the Orient and in Europe we follow a balance-of-power line, aiming to keep possible rivals divided and

weak, pushing back movements for real independence and popular unification where they seek to break through.

At home, so mild an internationalist as Sumner Welles has been eased out of an already conservative State Department and succeeded by E. R. Stettinius, with a U. S. Steel and General Motors background. The new Under Secretary, according to a widely circulated dispatch, "is considered likely to have a somewhat more nationalistic approach to foreign affairs than marked the attitude of Sumner Welles, who believed in the formation of a new League of Nations. . . . It is thought highly improbable that he will make any speeches urging an end to British imperialism as Welles did. On the other hand, he is expected to have the confidence of Congress!"

The one distinct note in our official anti-isolationism is that of joining with some other powers in keeping peace by armed force. Accordingly, those in power speak not in terms of disarmament but of a huge post-war military establishment and permanent conscription. No really serious consideration is being given to fundamental alterations in our tariff, monetary, and immigration policies. In this Washington, alas, reflects the unconsidered thinking of the man on the street.

The People and War

It would be possible to go on *ad infinitum*—almost—and certainly *ad nauseam,* with this dreary recital. For the time being, let us put a period to it, and ask what is the mind and mood of the American people in this situation. Not one of great enthusiasm for the war certainly, nor of great hope as to the post-war world. There is a good deal of fear about what will happen when war industry collapses, the immediate effect of which is considerable support for a program of very gradual demobilization, maintenance of large sectors of war industry and a predisposition to accept a good deal of regimentation in economic life as preferable to threatened unemployment and anarchy. There is, certainly among church people, a good deal of wistful wondering whether the war might not be brought to an end and a more promising foreign policy devised.

Under such circumstances there are several factors that keep Americans in the war. Multitudes "go along" because they do not see what else they can do. They feel inadequate to cope with vast impersonal forces and do not have the inner resources to stand as individuals. Another factor is the illusion—encouraged by the silence if not by the direct speech even of some pacifists—that even though we do not summon the wisdom and courage to do something creative about ending the war, we *can* make a new start on Armistice Day 1944 or 1950 and forge a creative peace. Idealistic non-pacifists cling to still another illusion that the relatively good nations will keep the relatively bad ones in line by force the next time.

But the main consideration that keeps Americans fighting on is, I think, the feeling that the only way to teach the Germans and Japanese once and for all that "aggression does not pay" is to administer a smashing military defeat and force an "unconditional surrender" in Berlin and Tokyo. It is not at all clear either to the American people or their government what is to happen after that, but they feel that there will be then at least a slender chance of patching up a decent world. In considerable measure this attitude stems from a moralistic feeling that evildoers must be punished so that the moral order of the universe may be vindicated.

Pacifists are thoroughly familiar with the basic argument against the possibility of effecting a moral conversion in an enemy people by beating them in war; normal small boys are equally so. *They* do not assume that being licked in a fight proves the loser to be morally in the wrong, nor do they expect it to lead to any great change in his character. Military defeat does not prove that it does not pay to make war; only that it does not pay unless you are stronger than your opponents.

Americans must decide what they want to do with the German people and then shape their policy accordingly. Fortunately they have evidently made up their minds not to try literally to exterminate them. Even the idea that the German people can or should be prevented from being ever again an important economic and political force in the world seems to have been pretty well abandoned. It has been pretty well recognized that such a policy would mean creating an economic desert or vacuum in the midst of Europe and would make a peaceful and democratic Europe impossible. It would involve enslaving the German people; presumably it is because the Nazis want to do that to others that we are fighting them.

So most people come round to what seems to them a plausible, sensible and moderate position: punish the Germans more severely than the last time, and then let them live and join in building a new world. But what does this mean specifically? Starving more German children by a blockade; taking away more resources and territory than before; lowering the standard of living further; keeping Germany waiting longer on the back steps of the League of Nations, or any such measures, can have only one result. The added suffering and humiliation will produce added resentment and thirst for revenge.

The Need for Reconciliation

In the end there is no escape from the Christian counsel to forgive your enemy as you hope he will forgive you—to be reconciled with him. It really ought not to occasion so much surprise to suggest this, as it does occasion even in church circles!

If we must put the matter in so-called practical terms, Professor Robert M. MacIver has given us the answer in his exceedingly useful new book, *Towards An Abiding Peace.* . . . "When we plan for peace we must abandon sides. We must think of the whole . . . no longer nation against nation, but nation joined with nation." The great question before the world is: How can we most quickly and effectively get all the peoples to cooperate in rebuilding the world in the interest of all, not of one or a few?

If this were really our policy as a nation, we would be saying it clearly and insistently to all the world, including the German and the Japanese people. We could not possibly wait until after the war to spring the news that this was what we had been after all the time! Furthermore, in this event we would be giving our closest attention not to the question of winning the war, i.e., continuing it, but to the question of stopping it. Obviously it is going to be hard enough to rebuild the world and to get real cooperation in doing it from everybody, even if we start in right now.

That we are not proclaiming such peace aims comes

from the simple fact that they are not our aims. We are a power-state, fighting for our "national interests."

Because that is the case we have no word of real cheer and inspiration for the people of Italy, Germany, or Japan. We proclaim "unconditional surrender," but in practice we deal with Badoglio and monarchists in Italy as with Franco in Spain.

We cannot give any real hope to the people of the little nations, Holland, Belgium and the rest. They know that so long as there is an armed world, they must be satellites of one power or another. So long as we pursue the game of power politics, they know that we will not countenance that economic and political unification that Europe needs in order to breathe and prosper.

Nor can we come to an understanding with Russia, because we will not permit her to dominate Europe and she will not tolerate our doing it.

The only hope of reviving quickly the hopes of all lovers of democracy and peace and avoiding a post-war era in comparison with which 1918-1936 will come to seem like a golden and happy age is for the United States to undertake at once to wage peace instead of war.

A Proclamation for Peace

That would mean that the people and government of this land would make to the world some such proclamation as this:

1. Let us stop being sentimentalists and come down to earth. We are ready to admit that we are not angels and supermen but human beings who have been fighting honestly but stupidly for what we conceived to be our "national interests." So have you who are no supermen either.

2. We are cured of our sentimentalism about war. Continued slaughter will get us nowhere. There is no good reason to suppose that we can get a better peace after another million of our sons have killed each other—or even a hundred thousand or a hundred. Every war has to end in people getting together and making peace. This one should end now.

3. We are ready to enter into a general Armistice agreement—all war activities to cease under the supervision of an international commission on which all nations shall have representatives.

4. As soon as this has been accepted the United States will ship food, vitamins, and medicines wherever they are needed most. (We can easily afford to put ten or twenty billion dollars into this and into a fund for economic rehabilitation if the war that costs us a hundred billion annually is stopped.)

5. We want each nation to take primary responsibility for establishing order and starting a peace economy within its own borders. We believe that you are quite capable of doing your own policing and rebuilding your shattered life, provided that fear of enslavement or domination by us, and fear of hunger are removed. At any rate, that's what you'll have to do. We are no longer such fools as to think we can police you and organize your life, any more than you could do it to or for us.

6. Since true peace can be built only on consent ("there is no peace between jailers and prisoners, no matter what righteousness the jailers proclaim," Professor MacIver reminds us) we propose that all nations participate on an equal basis in making the peace.

7. Since "making peace" really means organizing the daily lives of men in their economic, political, cultural and spiritual aspects, and since each people's well-being is tied up with that of others, we propose that the material resources and the manpower of all be regarded as a pool upon which a Joint Planning Commission may draw. If this means that for the good of all, the United States should advance credit in the form of machinery, for example, we are ready to do so. If it means that Germany should furnish workers to restore parts of Russia to fertility or of France and Belgium to productivity, or that Gentiles in Germany should help to rehabilitate Jews, they will, naturally, be expected to do that.

We recognize that this involves equal access for all peoples to the resources of the earth and in order to restore fructifying trade among nations, we are ready to modify our isolationist and narrowly selfish tariff policy.

8. We are ready to take our full share of responsibility in establishing some form of world government. We recognize that this involves internationalization of the Panama as well as of the Suez Canal and the approaches to the Baltic and Black Seas.

9. We propose abandonment of all national military establishments, including our own. Small military establishments are worthless in the modern world. Nations can have neither democracy nor prosperity if they have to carry the burden of big ones.

To formulate and proclaim such peace aims involves no serious risk. Failure on the part of our government to do so can mean in the last analysis only that we have no such purposes. In that case no Christians have any business supporting a war fought for the ends of power politics and certain to lead to another and greater war.

In view of the course of American foreign policy to which we have referred, let no one suggest that these proposals spell appeasement. Only by making such proposals as this can we give assurance that the United States is through with appeasing the Darlans, Badoglios, Francos, Petains, Churchills, Stalins, and Goerings or German militarists, industrialists and Junkers, and our own reactionaries, racists and fascists. Only in this way can a real wedge be driven between the dictators and their peoples. Nothing would so quickly end Hitler's control over the German people and armies and start the democratic revolution sweeping the world. Physically Hitler might continue to live in such a world as we have pictured. Certainly no one would any longer cherish the fantastic notion that killing him would solve any problem even to a small degree. Spiritually Hitler could not live in such a world without "getting religion."

That leads to a final word. The reader probably has been thinking that unless the peoples experience a reorientation, a spiritual rebirth, such a proposal cannot be made, accepted or carried out. That is true. Without this there will be no peace in 1943 or 1953. But consider; those who believe that after a United Nations victory there will be a true peace, assume that there will be such a spiritual revolution then. Many say that we shall have it. But if it can be then, it can be now. Furthermore, the longer we put it off, the less likely we are to get it. The period after a great war is notoriously one of spiritual letdown. If defeated peoples are somewhat chastened, victors go in for revenge and jazz. There is nothing clearer in a moral universe than that now—not tomorrow or next year—"is the accepted time; now is the day of salvation." The drinker who resolves to sober up after one more binge, never does sober up. If he resolves to sober up now, he has a tough job cut out for himself, but he has a chance.

Because these things are so true, we must say them again on Armistice Day and every day, even though we be voices crying in the wilderness. If the task seems so hard that we despair of ourselves and are thrown back upon God—so much the better.

"I'd rather go to war any time than work in a mental hospital," declared a frank army officer recently. Yet more than a thousand COs are working there, for

They Asked for a Hard Job

By FRANK OLMSTEAD

Field Work Director, War Resisters League

THERE are more than 1,100 conscientious objectors serving in America's mental hospitals today, on "detached service" from the camps that were the original formula for Civilian Public Service. Openings for them and for the other hundreds who probably will join them in the months ahead came about as the result of the COs' demands for "more significant" work than they had been given in the camps themselves.

I had visited hundreds of men in the camps, and heard their complaints about the nature of the "work of national importance" they had been given to do. I was anxious to discover whether the mental hospital opportunities really provided significant work, and the best way of finding out seemed to be to spend several weeks in various hospitals working with the conscientious objector-attendants at their regular jobs. This is the report of one such visit.

I reached the first institution I was to visit one Saturday noon. I was to be an attendant there for a week. They were short-handed and after I had had lunch and changed into old clothes and shoes, they hustled me over to the incontinent building. The wind was blowing toward me, and as I came up the drive of the spacious grounds, my nose would have told me a long block away what "incontinent" meant, even if I had not known that it is so they designate those who cannot control the natural functions.

The Charge met me at the door. The attendant in charge seems always to carry that convenient label. He used a key from a large bunch on a chain to let me in and carefully locked the door again, a proceeding that soon became automatic for me but never quite lost its symbolic meaning. We had keys and we were free to go. To the patients we were jailers who kept them in.

After a perfunctory tour of the building, the Charge took me to a door which he unlocked. We stepped in.

In Charge of the Day-Room

First there was the odor. Outdoors it had been decidedly disagreeable; inside the front door it had become nauseating, but when we stepped into that room the unadulterated stench was overpowering.

A young CO attendant came up and the Charge introduced us. Then he became apologetic. He hated to do this but they were terribly short-handed—would I mind if he left me alone in charge of this day-room? I hope my voice sounded more convincing than I felt as I assured him that it would be all right. So the two went out, locking me in, and as I did not yet have my keys there was no way for me to get out and no method of communicating with them. I was there to stay until they could return in an hour and a half. The Charge's last words were: "Don't be worried. Less than a dozen of them are at all violent"!

I have been in storms at sea, in train wrecks, and in Moscow during the Bolshevik revolution, but I have never had quite the feeling that I had when I turned from that locked door to face three hundred insane incontinents. Some were wrapped up in their own dream worlds, but more than a hundred of them gathered in a circle around me and stared. They were trying to size me up. Was I a "tough guy" who would beat them up, an easy mark they could work, or just plain scared? I was the last all right, but I knew enough to guess what was in their minds. It mattered terribly to them what kind of person this new attendant might turn out to be. All I had to do was to act as natural as possible and give them time to study me. I was at least as safe as in a crowd on Times Square.

Half the men were entirely naked. They all start the day with underclothes of blue denim suits, but by noon some of the clothes are torn up and others have gravitated to certain individuals whose mental state demands clothes as that of others demands nudity. Some had on five or six suits. Almost all were barefoot. Some of the unclothed ones were fat and seemed to be well-fed; others were walking skeletons. Many had feet swollen to twice their normal size from urine poisoning and standing all day on the cold cement floor. Some had great sores on various parts of their anatomy. Back of all this was the terrible smell that would not be forced out of consciousness. Two working patients were mopping and cleaning in a desultory fashion, but even their best efforts did not remove the odor, nor could they do anything about the soiled clothes and persons of many of the patients.

Convention does not permit the printed page to carry all the details incident to the more perverted. Perhaps it was the complete departure from conventional standards that was most disturbing. Inhibitions were gone; the inner censor was asleep and men behaved accordingly.

When the Charge and the young attendant returned we began at once to get ready for dinner. Benches were shoved against the wall, leaving room for only a single line down to the dining-room. Some two-thirds of the men, in a sort of mob spirit, jammed up against the benches in their effort to get to the front of the line before others. The Charge set an example of vigorously plucking them off of the rear of the mob to relieve the pressure that might have hurt those closest to the wall. Finally a certain amount of order was restored and two of us shifted to the dining-room, leaving one man to keep the line in order.

Working patients dished out the food at a counter to which many of the men charged down like ravenous wolves.

For that reason they were let in three or four at a time. This first meal consisted of a dish of string beans, a bowl of soup, four slices of bread, and a large cup of coffee. These were served in a deep aluminum tray. The patients most lacking in control would grab their tray, try to take food from someone else, and as they rushed to the table pour beans, soup, and coffee all together and drink it in slobbering gulps from a corner of the tray. Soon the floor was slippery with spilled food, but the most we could do was to try to control the snatchers who, after finishing their own food, tried to grab from the more restrained eaters.

The hour after dinner passed quietly and at 7:30 the undressing process began. Every man had to take off his clothes and throw them in a great heap by the door. Some men needed only a hint while others gave up their covering with extreme reluctance. They would protest that it wasn't dark, or that too many others were present. It took half an hour to get the three hundred stripped and in line for inspection before going to bed. Those who were hopelessly dirty were headed for the shower room while others were allowed to go immediately to the dormitories. No man had a particular bed or dorm although there was a slight attempt to keep the more irresponsible ones in the basement.

When all the bath candidates had been herded into the shower room, the water was turned on full force, a man put under each of a dozen showers and scrubbed by the CO attendant and me with ordinary floor brooms until some degree of cleanliness was attained. Most of them accepted the shower as a necessary evil. If they slipped out and tried to avoid the bath it was easy to locate them because of their filthy condition.

The beds had fairly decent mattresses, rubber sheets, two white sheets and a single blanket. When all the men were in bed I was left downstairs in charge of two dorms holding nearly two hundred men. The CO was on the main floor with one hundred men and had supervision of the working patients in the kitchen. The Charge on the top floor was trying to do his book work, keep an eye on the working patient dorm, and look after the sixteen men in the sickroom—men sick enough so that two of them died that week.

It is difficult to describe the problems of attendants in such circumstances without offending the sensibilities. Some trouble might be avoided by routing out certain men after a few hours and seeing to it that they went to the toilet, but no amount of care could prevent trouble. The chief problem lay in keeping the floor from becoming so slippery that there was danger of the patients falling and hurting themselves in the semi-darkness. All this meant fairly strenuous work with mop and pan since some had a half-urge toward decency and would get out of bed to use the floor for the calls of nature. Most of the soiled beds remained untouched until morning. Time and sheets were too scarce to do anything else. The men wore no night clothes, which simplified matters.

Three attendants for more than three hundred and fifty patients is entirely inadequate. The particular building in which I worked was originally planned for one hundred and fifty men with twelve attendants. The war has created a scarcity that is confronting mental hospitals with a tremendous problem. Most of them were sadly overcrowded and undermanned in the first place. The draft takes many attendants and better-paid jobs in industry take others.

Later, when I visited another institution, I was relieved to discover that its standards were much higher. There were fewer patients per attendant, more subdivision so that the better patients were not forced to live with the most hopeless, and physical provisions were more adequate. The day-room for three hundred men in the first institution I visited had not a single thing in it but heavy benches, and not enough of those for everyone to sit down at once. Probably nearly half of the men were curable, mixed with the incurable. In the better institution there were tables and chairs and at least a minimum of newspapers, magazines and radio music, and the hopeless cases were not left with the others.

In normal times psychiatric treatment is supposed to be a part of the program for each man and for all who may be expected to improve. At the present time the war has taken the doctors in wholesale fashion and almost no help is given the patients of institutions which have no over-age men or women psychiatrists on the staff. Certainly many who might by prompt action be cured are drifting steadily into the incurable class. This is particularly tragic in the case of men from the present war.

Non-Violence and the Insane

One thing I wanted to find out was whether a conscientious objector, through his methods of non-violent good will, has something to contribute to the mental hospital. In theory I am convinced that the answer is "No." Every psychiatrist with whom I talked believed in and practiced non-violence. But practically the COs may prove to be a revolutionary factor in these institutions.

Psychiatrists who have the training and correct techniques have only casual contact with patients, whereas the attendants, who have no training and know only the methods dictated by their own fears, are alone with the patients all day long.

In the institutions in which I worked there were attendants who used violence. A number were heartless and brutal. Others ruled by fear but seldom really hurt a patient. It was obvious that the hospital authorities were well informed of what was going on, but to fire a man because he almost certainly broke a patient's arm, as in one case I helped to treat, would leave the institution that much more undermanned. In the face of manpower shortages, replacements are impossible.

As a matter of record, no patient ever is injured in a hospital except by "accident" or as "the result of a fall." Strangely enough, when the COs were introduced into one of the hospitals the number of "accidents" decreased 40 per cent in three months' time!

One objector assigned to the violent ward refused to take the broomstick offered by the Charge. When he entered the ward the patients crowded round asking, "Where is your broomstick?" He said he thought he would not need it. "But suppose some of us gang up on you?" The CO guessed they wouldn't do that, and started talking about other things. Within two or three days the patients were seen gathered around the unarmed attendant, telling him their troubles. He felt much safer than the Charge who had only his broomstick for company.

Francis was one of the three hundred patients in the

big day-room. He would go into tantrums if he couldn't get his own way, throw himself on the floor wailing and screaming, and would scratch and bite anyone who attempted to move or otherwise control him. There were great sores on his temples from his violent contacts with the cement floor. Sometimes another patient inadvertently would get in his way and Francis would bite his ear. This was no gentle bite. One patient had a piece of ear an inch long hanging down as a result of such an encounter.

I tried earnestly but unsuccessfully to reach Francis. One of my hands still carries a scar from his scratching and he almost had my hand in his mouth more than once, grabbing it to try to bite it. No one on that shift was able to make any headway with him. Then came another shift that brought a CO who greeted Francis with a cheery word and an arm thrown around his shoulder. There were no tantrums all morning.

Just before lunch, however, it looked as though we were in for trouble again. Francis was trying to say something but no one was able to make out his mumblings. Francis' face began to work and he trembled all over. The CO put a hand on his shoulder. "Wait a minute, Francis, I didn't understand what you were telling me. Say it again more slowly." Francis tried again. "Oh, you want your drawers pulled up?" Francis vigorously nodded his head. He could not pull up his drawers himself because he thought he could not put his hands down—they were never seen below shoulder level when he was awake, so that he had to be dressed and fed. The CO turned him around, unbuttoned his coveralls, rescued the offending apparel and fastened them securely so that there would be no more trouble. Then he put his arm across Francis' shoulder, drew those great teeth down to his ear so as to hear him better, and visited with him for fifteen minutes. It struck me that if there was one ear that was safe in that room it was the ear of that man who was Francis' only friend.

In the short time at my disposal I tried pacifist techniques on a few patients. One was a prize fighter, whose friendship I soon won. He attached himself firmly to me, threatening to "clean up" anyone who offered to do me harm. There was not another fight in that ward for the rest of the day, for this was the man who caused most of the trouble. Every time he wanted to fight he was right at my elbow where I could talk him out of it.

Another was a big husky who constantly threatened to kill people. He was most reluctant to take off his clothes at night. The first night the Charge, terrifying but not really brutal, took thirty minutes of divided attention between him and other patients getting him undressed. First he swore at him, then beat him with a towel, and finally whaled him over the head and back with the soft part of the broom. Actually the man was not physically hurt but he was frightened half to death. Finally he gave in and undressed. For the next two days I cultivated this man without appearing to make much headway, but the third night, merely by talking to him I was able to get him completely undressed in less than five minutes of fluctuating attention.

Technique or Philosophy?

I am inclined to think that there is a real difference between psychological techniques of controlling a patient and the genuine friendliness and good will that may characterize the better psychologists as well as the better type of COs. It is easy to prevent violence by diverting attention. The working patient is apt to have a sudden desire to attack someone with his mop. It is the simplest thing in the world to meet such a man with some little show of interest and excitement, beckoning him aside to say, "Oh, you have that mop. Please get this place clean." Once a man came at a CO with clenched fist and was met by the attendant beckoning him urgently to the radiator and asking whether there were any cockroaches behind it. Such little devices are remarkably effective in diverting a patient's attention along a new line.

But there is a difference between this and the kind of thing the CO develops. In one ward when a working patient charged me with his mop I smiled at him with as genuine a show of interest as I could muster and said, "Well, Joe, what's the matter now?" He stopped short, rubbed his eyes, shook his head like a dog shaking off water, and returned to his mopping without a word. I was not there long enough to win the degree of friendliness with him that one of the other COs had acquired, but it was interesting that that attendant was never threatened with attack.

Most of the mental hospital COs are genuine pacifists, convinced that there is a force of good will more powerful than violence and more permanent in its gains for the individual and for society. They want to put their faith to work at a point of real need and welcome the disagreeable and often dangerous work of the mental institutions. It is noteworthy that I heard not one complaint about the work from any of the more than a hundred men with whom I worked in the hospitals.

The chief trouble with mental institutions is that they are woefully overcrowded. They are largely State institutions, filled to overflowing. Attendants usually are underpaid. A man who has to put up with the disagreeable and often dangerous vicissitudes of such work should be well rewarded, but instead he is apt to get $60 a month, plus room and meals. Some institutions make no provision for men to live with their wives unless they do so outside the grounds at their own expense.

Another problem lies in the lack of an orientation course. Attendants should be taught enough about the patient so that they are able to shake off the fear which usually results in brutality. Some of the men appear to have a sadistic streak, but they are the exception. Most of them simply are afraid and meet the situation by trying to get there before the patient with their violence. If they could know in advance how easy these "madmen" are to handle, the fear would be gone and with it much of the hell that is developed for patients who have to live under the regime of attendants who beat their way to control.

The number of patients in these hospitals is increasing until there are now close to half a million who are being supported by the State, not to mention private institutions. It will be interesting to see what effect a large number of COs have on the situation in the years to come. Many COs are well equipped, some with graduate school training, and they are alert, sensitive and eager to serve. It will be surprising if they do not register powerfully in this mental hospital situation before they get through cashing in on their experiences at the conclusion of the war.

Phillips Elliott Elected Chairman of Fellowship

Phillips Packer Elliott, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, N. Y., was unanimously chosen for national chairman of the Fellowship for the coming year by the National Council, meeting in Chicago, September 24-26. He succeeds Arthur Swift, whose appointment to direct the Department of Relief and Rehabilitation at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California, made it impossible for him to be considered for reelection. The Council adopted a resolution expressing the affection and gratitude of the Fellowship toward Professor Swift. All other national officers were reelected.

Other actions by the Council included the approval of a department of race relations, to be headed by James Farmer and Bayard Rustin, and adoption of resolutions on race relations and matters relating to COs. The Council also appointed a Rural Life Committee, composed of Merlin Miller, Dan West, Carl Landes, Chester Graham, and Albert Livezey.

Attendance at most of the conferences was good, with that at the Chicago meeting running well ahead of last year and that at Philadelphia somewhat behind.

Statement on Race Relations

The Council seized the occasion of the extension of the Fellowship's work in the field of race through its new Race Relations Department to issue a strongly worded statement on the subject of racial tensions in the United States. After reviewing the factors that have aggravated relations between the races and evaluating the results nationally and internationally, the statement issued a direct challenge to churches and colleges to disown Jim Crow practices. The statement continued by calling on "all progressive liberal and democratic people and agencies" to unite on a five-point program, as follows:

1. Abolition of Jim Crow practices in the armed forces and in all departments of government.

2. Adoption of a National Fair Racial Practices Act.

3. Abolition of the poll tax.

4. Re-vitalizing of the Fair Employment Practices Committee.

5. Repeal of Oriental Exclusion legislation, and prompt relocation of Americans of Japanese descent in adequate jobs and hospitable communities.

India Caught in Grip of Famine

Famine is reported to be raging through large sections of India, taking an appalling toll of lives. Thousands are dying of starvation daily. An Associated Press dispatch from New Delhi reported on October 19 that Calcutta's mortality rate had risen from a normal of 573 deaths weekly to more than two thousand weekly.

Upton Close, radio commentator, declared that Gandhi has asked the Viceroy to release him to help in the work of famine relief, and warned that the aged Indian leader might resort to a "fast unto death" if the request was denied. A cable from London to the *New York Times* on October 7 reported that the British are deeply shocked by reports from India and hold themselves responsible for the famine.

The FOR Executive Committee has appealed to President Roosevelt to intervene with an offer of material and financial aid in the emergency.

Southern Work Camp Wins Negro Approval

An interracial work camp in the city of Nashville, devised as a substitute for the country camp originally planned by the Southern FOR when the latter became unavailable, turned out to be the most successful method yet found for making new Negro contacts, according to Constance Rumbough, Southern FOR Secretary.

Of the sixteen campers who made their headquarters in a cottage on the Fisk University campus, only two were Negro. Nevertheless, as the work of redecorating the Fisk Social Center progressed, they were joined almost daily by other Negro residents of the vicinity.

The camp, Miss Rumbough reports, with its sincere interracial emphasis raised the prestige of the FOR immensely among Negroes. She urged that several such camps be organized next summer, and that similar methods be used by Fellowship groups for year-round local situations.

Albert E. Barnett, FOR member from Nashville, has been appointed Professor of New Testament Ethics at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago.

Work Strikes Continue In Two Federal Prisons

Work strikes by COs are continuing in both Danbury (Conn.) and Lewisburg (Pa.) prisons, where conscientious objectors are using this method of protesting racial segregation within the prisons. It is reported also that at least five prisoners at Lewisburg, including David Dellinger and Paton Price, have been on a hunger strike since September 28.

An exchange of correspondence on the Lewisburg situation between A. J. Muste and Federal Prison Director James V. Bennett brought the unequivocal statement from the latter that race segregation is the established policy of the Bureau of Prisons and will not be changed.

". . . After very careful consideration," wrote Mr. Bennett, "the prison authorities feel that (a solution to the race question) can best be achieved through separation in line with the generally accepted practice of the community at large."

To this statement the FOR Executive Committee addressed a strongly worded reply, declaring that such a policy is "utterly repugnant to democratic and Christian principles, and an expression of the racist attitudes against which this nation is supposedly struggling today."

Forerunners Interest Found Widespread

Margaret Ann Osborn, new national secretary for the Forerunners, FOR-sponsored organization for high-school-age young people, reported widespread interest in the group and in its study materials after her first field trip through the East.

City-wide organizations have been set up in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Buffalo and there is a growing demand among high school teachers of history and social studies for the two Forerunners studybooks: *Pattern for Peacemakers* and *New Wars for Old,* both of which have had to go into third editions recently.

Leaflets Available

The following materials are available from the national office for distribution by members:

Would You Like to See the War End Today?—4-page leaflet including petition for a statement of peace aims by our government. 50¢ per 100.

Help Stop the Drift Toward Total Conscription—1-page flier, $1.00 per 100.

Opening Up Jobs for Minority Group Members—2-page mimeographed memorandum from the FOR Race Relations Department. 3¢ each; 50 for $1.00.

CPS 1944 Set-Up Not Yet Decided

As this issue of *Fellowship* went to press, the final decision had not yet been made on whether the present Civilian Public Service program for conscientious objectors will be continued through 1944 under the direction of the Peace Church Service Committees, or part or all of the program be handed back to the government.

The Service Committees met with General Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service director, on October 14, and indicated their willingness to continue the program if certain proposals are accepted by Selective Service. There has been no official indication of the latter body's attitude toward the proposals.

The points brought out by the Service Committees and the National Service Board for Religious Objectors would, if accepted, meet many of the criticisms directed against CPS by Fellowship members and others. They are:

1. Pay for all COs who desire it.

2. Congressional provision for the dependents of COs.

3. At least half the men placed on detached service or maintenance projects.

4. Religious agencies in the future to take only such men as wish to come to their camps. All such assignees to spend from one to three months in an orientation experience at a reception center camp. Management and discipline in the camps to be entirely in the hands of the Service Committees and the campers, so that they may operate along pacifist lines and not be agencies through which Selective Service orders are transmitted.

5. Men to be directed promptly into projects for which they are fitted by skill and training, and new projects opened up in which the men can definitely meet human needs.

Three More Sentenced

Paul Johnson, formerly director of the Cooperstown CPS camp and of a Friends work camp in Mexico, was sentenced on September 27 to three years in prison for refusal to fill out his questionnaire. Francis Hall, FOR field secretary, and Bob Luitweiller, of the Free India Committee, were sentenced to three years each on October 8 and 5 respectively, in Newark, N. J. It was the second term for each.

Printing Delays

Unforeseen difficulties faced by our printer have delayed publication of *Outcasts* and *The Fall of Christianity*. Both will be out this month.

Faith-in-Human Nature Dep't, American Legion Division

National Commander Roane Waring told the AL convention, "As soon as this war is over, the same slimy pacifists will come back with a raving flow of pacifism. The theory that war will be over forever is idealistic dreaming. There will be war as long as men and human selfishness exist."

Our Man-Building Army

"The army's making men of them." *Quentin Reynolds, on a recent radio program.*

"This is a school for murder," the Major tells his class. "Murder is my business. Not the vague shooting of unknown people in combat, but the personal, individual killing of a man in cold blood. It's an art which you have to study, practice, and perfect.

"The average Englishman or American, unfortunately, suffers from remorse. You must overcome that, or it will slow you down and cause your own death. Shooting a Jerry is like swatting a fly. Keep thinking that, shoot a few, and you'll sleep like a baby after the bloodiest shambles. . . ." —*School for Murder* (a description of training classes for British and American commando fighters), New York *Herald-Tribune,* Oct. 17, 1943.

"I was drunk," California police were told October 6 by the confessed strangler of an 18-year-old girl. "I guess I lost my head. I just got back from Guadalcanal where killing is so easy nobody thinks anything of it."

"Killing now for him (the soldier after his first battle) is as much a profession as writing is for me. He wants to kill individually or in vast numbers. He wants to see the Germans overrun, mangled, butchered in the Tunisian trap. He speaks excitedly of seeing great heaps of dead, of our bombers sinking whole shiploads of fleeing men, of Germans by the thousand dying miserably in a final Tunisian holocaust of his own making." Ernie Pyle, in the New York *World-Telegram,* April 22, 1943.

COs Worry Legion

Forty resolutions attacking COs and CPS, presented at the national convention of the American Legion, finally were whittled down to one. It urged that CPS be administered with greater strictness.

Changes of address should be mailed in before the first of the month. Please include new postal zone numbers.

Jottings

CPS men are playing the role of guinea pigs in a variety of experiments not especially conducive to peace of mind. Of one of them, Colonel Kosch of Selective Service said to the Senate Military Affairs Committee: "If the experiment works, the men will not get anything. If it does not, they will get influenza." * * *

Rumania has decreed the death penalty for all who refuse military service "for religious or other reasons." The Adventists are the largest of several small pacifist sects in Rumania. The government for several years has conducted an intermittent campaign against Adventists, Baptists, and other Protestant groups.

* * *

The American Friends Service Committee is asking for 50,000 Christmas gifts for children (up to 18 years) in the Japanese-American Relocation Centers. Last year the Committee delivered to the Centers 17,000 gifts from more than 860 persons and organizations. Full information may be had from the AFSC, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

* * *

The CPS Unit at the New Lisbon, N. J., Colony for the Feeble-Minded reports that about 150 of the inmates have been paroled to the army.

* * *

Margaret Doty and Dorothy Riley (5659 S. Drexel, Chicago 27, Ill.) have dreamed up the idea of making things easier for CO wives who either move to a location near CPS camp or are struggling along at home. They'd like CO wives to write them, either offering or seeking help.

* * *

The Free India Committee (2013 Fifth Avenue, New York) is trying to promote a demonstration to "break the silence of the press" on the terrible famine now raging in India. They urge FOR groups to organize and participate in "petition marches" for Thanksgiving Day in cities throughout the country. * * *

The nurse-in-charge of the State Mental Hospital at Concord, N. H., after reporting an incident in which three COs dissuaded an inmate who was bent on suicide, said, "This building has never been so quiet as it has been since the COs took over. I don't know what I'd do without them."

* * *

An AP dispatch from Washington, dated September 27, says that top government officials no longer favor the idea of an international police force. Instead, they feel that each of the "big four" should keep mobilized forces large enough "to discourage acts of aggression." Four strong, heavily armed powers, competing with one another for trade and spheres of influence—these will guarantee peace. And they call us dreamers!

Pacifists in British Empire Continue Their Witness

The following material is taken from the annual report of John Nevin Sayre concerning the work of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation. Copies of the full report may be had on request.

A report of the *British* Fellowship for the war years 1939-1943 shows an increase of membership from 9,813 in 1939 to 12,669 in March 1943. There are 411 branches. There were 1,808 FOR conscientious objectors as recorded to January 1943. Of 879 who appeared before Local Tribunals, 119 were given unconditional exemption, 491 conditional exemption, 213 noncombatant duties, and 56 full military service. 198 appeared before Appellate Tribunals, 64 refused medical examinations, and 70 were imprisoned.

In *India,* FOR members are maintaining contact with one another, but the forming of FOR groups, as well as the publication of a simple news-letter, just for themselves, has been prohibited by the government despite the conciliatory efforts of Donald Groom, secretary of the Indian Quaker Center.

Horace Alexander had interviews with Gandhi before and during his fast. Also Gladys Owen, a former colleague of Muriel Lester, talked with Gandhi during the fast. Muriel Lester received in June a letter from Mr. Rajagopalachari, President of Madras, which said: "I suppose you get *some* news of India and guess how we are all feeling. As for my own mind, you can have it in a few simple sentences. The Congress, including Gandhiji, made serious mistakes. The British government is mercilessly exploiting those mistakes. The world has consequently lost a great chance. A great good thing could have been done, but the British government has resolved not to do it."

New Zealand Pacifists Jailed

In *New Zealand,* the Rev. O. E. Burton, chairman of the Christian Pacifist Society (the FOR group) is still in "reformative detention" serving a two-and-one-half year sentence in Napier prison.

The whole FOR group has carried on a courageous contest for civil liberties ever since August 1940 when the police dissolved their meetings. The president, the secretary, and eight members, including one woman, were sentenced to from three to twelve months because they insisted on holding public meetings. In spite of resignations, the membership of the Christian Pacifist Society has increased from 375 to 554 since the beginning of the war. More than seventy members of pacifist groups are in concentration camps and prisons. One of them was sentenced to a year's imprisonment merely for posting the *Bulletins* of the Society. An Anglican clergyman has written to England: "No pamphlets can be published such as you have in England without gaol and suppression; though a week ago the first peace candidate in our history managed to put up at a by-election and the leaflets were allowed."

Australia Has 3,000 COs

In *Australia,* the Federal Pacifist Council has sent letters to every member of Federal and State Parliaments urging that an "unconditional surrender" policy is extreme and hazardous and that the government should declare more clearly on what basis it would treat with the Axis powers. Australia has 3,000 conscientious objectors. One of the leading pacifists there, the Rev. Frank Coaldrake, editor of *The Peacemaker,* has been appointed assistant to the Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne.

In *South Africa,* study groups are concerning themselves intensively with post-war problems. Grahamstown announces the formation of a local FOR group.

The reorganization of the *Canadian* FOR and its affiliation with IFOR, which was effected in May, is showing excellent results. An Executive Secretary has just been appointed in the person of Albert Watson and agreement has been reached to merge several small pacifist news-letters into one journal, named *Reconciliation,* to be launched very soon. During the summer the Rev. James Finlay visited nearly all the CO camps in the Canadian West and the FOR appears to have made some progress with the Government in obtaining improved treatment for COs.

Good Will In Action Saves Family's Home

Fellowship members and other liberals won a victory for tolerance and good will in Spokane, Washington, this Fall; and as a result the Suzukis are living happily in the home they bought in that city.

Dr. Suzuki and his wife came to Spokane with their two small children as a result of the evacuation of the West Coast area. They bought a house, in a "not strictly lily-white neighborhood," after the former owner had got fourteen neighbors to sign a statement agreeing that they had no objection to having a Japanese-American family move in.

However, after the move had been made opposition developed. A local real estate man mobilized sentiment against the Suzukis, and legal efforts were begun to bar them from their home. FOR workers began to mobilize good will against this effort. Calls were made on Protestant and Catholic clergymen in the community, while FOR volunteers also visited most of the families in the neighborhood, including the opposition. A Spokane attorney interested in civil liberties was added to the growing defense.

The climax of the affair came one evening, shortly after a rock had been hurled through the Suzukis' front window. A delegation of "neighbors" had threatened to call on the Suzukis in a further effort to force them out. When they arrived they found in the Suzuki living-room fifteen people, including a Catholic priest and four Protestant ministers. Their spokesman, somewhat nonplussed, was at first menacing, then apologetic. The whole situation was thoroughly discussed, and before the evening ended everybody shook hands.

Service Opportunities

The following notices have come to the *Fellowship* office and are published here as a service to our members:

Boys Village, an interracial farm attempt to work out a fresh and Christian way of dealing with juvenile delinquency, is located at West Berne, N. Y. It is conducted by three FOR members: Eddy Deskins, a Negro, and Lilyan and Jerry Haigh, a white couple. Financial and other help is needed.

William Penn College, a Quaker college located in Oskaloosa, Iowa, wishes to locate a printer. Address communications to President Errol T. Elliott.

There is an opening in the *School of Living,* Suffern, N. Y., for a young couple. Remuneration on a cooperative basis, each person receiving $5 per week, plus room, board, and laundry.

The *Quaker Emergency Service,* 345 Lexington Avenue, New York 16, N. Y., is seeking for volunteers to work in settlement houses, child care centers, and hospitals. The QES also is conducting a series of courses on child care, post-war reconstruction, social case work, juvenile delinquency and prison reform, etc.

Two new guinea-pig projects are now under way with CPS men as the g-p's. One on jaundice is being conducted at the Philadelphia State Hospital, while the second, on atypical pneumonia, has Gatlinburg, Tennessee, as its home laboratory.

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Roger Axford, 740 Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Jean G. McKay, 1625 Buchanan Street, San Francisco, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 440 East 13th Avenue, Denver 3, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Merom, Ind.; *Refugee:* Marion Frenyear, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

The Peacemaker's Bookshelf

Four Books on Race

Brothers Under the Skin, by Carey McWilliams, Little, Brown & Co. 1943. 325 pages. $3.50.

New World A-Coming, by Roi Ottley, Houghton, Mifflin Co. 1943. 364 pages. $3.00.

No Day of Triumph, by J. Saunders Redding, Harper & Bros. 1943. 342 pages. $3.00.

Between Tears and Laughter, by Lin Yutang, The John Day Co. 1943. 216 pages. $2.50.

Indicative of the importance these days of the so-called race problem is the fact that four such remarkable books as these should come off the press within a few months. Since the problem is with us in any case, we may perhaps consider that these books are an illustration of how in a certain sense good may come out of evil. From every one of them, readers will derive enlightenment, that catharsis of the emotions which the Greeks regarded as the function of drama, pleasure even in the midst of sadness, and inspiration to act.

McWilliams first came to public attention through his works on migrant labor, *Factories in the Field,* and *Ill Fares the Land.* There are chapters in his new book on "The Non-Vanishing Indian"; "The Long-Suffering Chinese"; "The Forgotten Mexican"; "Our Japanese Hostages"; "Hawaii: Island Outpost"; "The Puerto Ricans and Other Islanders"; "The Little Brown Brothers" (Filipinos); and "The Negro Problem: A Case History." These chapters are crammed with useful information about the minority groups with which they respectively deal. Much of it the ordinary reader would find elsewhere only with great difficulty if at all.

From one standpoint the chapter on the Japanese is the least satisfactory because it dodges the main current issue: "It would serve no purpose to debate the question of whether or not total mass evacuation should or should not have been ordered. The fact is that the decision was made by the military" —is that the whole story?—"and it is to be presumed that it was dictated by good and sufficient reasons." Why presumed? This seems to be another clear illustration of how the liberal or radical who decides to support war finds it impossible to think, or at least speak, directly on certain crucial social issues. Apart from this, even this chapter on the Japanese is excellent.

McWilliams' main emphasis in connection with remedies is on Federal action, including a Fair Racial Practices Act, which would give national scope to the laws protecting the civil rights of Negroes, and forbidding segregation which some states have.

For anyone who is interested in what is going on among Negroes today and in working for the improvement of relations between whites and Negroes, by far the most useful and important of these four books is Roi Ottley's *New World A-Coming.* I should say it is indispensable for the library of every Fellowship member or family.

Here again the titles of some of the chapters give the best idea in brief compass as to what the book is about: "Capital of Black America" (Harlem); "Passage to Utopia" (a close-packed summary of a couple hundred years of Negro history in the United States); "Up, You Mighty Race" (Marcus Garvey's movement); "I Talked With God" (Father Divine's Peace Movement "with the magic trinity of No Race, No Sex, and No Money"); "The Jobs for Negroes Campaign" (Harlem and "slum-shocked Negroes during the depression); "Found: The Lost Tribe of Black Jews" (five thousand in a single synagogue in Harlem); "The Black Cabineteers" (a group of Negroes who hold or have held government posts in Washington). A chapter entitled "Glamour Boy," is about Adam Clayton Powell, Baptist minister and member of the New York City Council, and speaks of him as "an incredible combination of showman, black parson, and Tammany Hall—at once a salvationist, politician, economic messiah, and playboy."

Members of the Fellowship who are interested in the non-violent good-will action program to abolish Jim Crow sponsored by the March On Washington Movement, will be impressed by Ottley's observation about its leader, A. Philip Randolph: "Free from scheming or duplicity, honest to the point of being almost naive, he has nevertheless achieved a position of great strategic importance at a crucial moment in our history. He is unique among Negro leaders, in that he is neither preacher, educator, nor rabble-rousing politician, but a labor organizer.—What seems to captivate Negroes, is the impression he gives of being all soul."

The Touch of a Poet

If you want to follow up Ottley with a book in which one who has the gifts and the touch of a novelist and poet describes what Jim Crow means to individuals, including himself, J. Saunders Redding's *No Day of Triumph* is the book for you. It does not spare the sensibilities of the reader. But it contains such observations as the following, which will give Fellowship readers an idea how Redding's insights often seem to be pacifist in nature or tendency. A Negro in a West Virginia coal town speaks of how Okies in the West and Negro miners in his own state find "There's no man to fight. You can't fight a damned bomb. And you can't fight a company. So you begin to scheme. You get depraved with scheming against the company." And later: "Then they go to the courts, and when they go to the courts, they're already being depraved. It's not justice they're looking for. They don't expect justice in the courts.—They're after vengeance. My God, I hate it." It is a Negro lawyer who said that.

Tears and Laughter

From the standpoint of race relationships, the Lin Yutang book is important because it takes the global view and sees a vast conflict between Orient and Occident already virtually assured because western imperialism will not retire gracefully from the Orient, and is following the fatal policy of "win the war first and use your brains afterward." Its sections dealing with the independence of India are priceless. As the title suggests, you will laugh many times with the author, as when he calls Culbertson's system "Peace by point rations"; or when he observes that he has often wondered what was in that burden the white man carried on his back, and has discovered that it is—canned goods.

But you will shed tears too, or come close to it. For so embittered is this civilized and urbane man by the white man's air of superiority, and the crudeness and cruelty of his imperialism, that he has come to the conclusion that "China should travel the road with America and England in the next decades as a friendly nation," on this condition, that while posing as friendly, "China must learn the important lesson of acting for national self-interest as western nations have done and are doing." He has a "mystic" intuition that China "is coming up—and nothing the western nations can do can stop her or keep her down." This can only mean that China presently shall play the game of power-politics too. Yet he can condemn Japan for having acted on the same "lesson" that he now wants China to act on, and cries out: "Americans want to kill the Japs" (like so many guests of this nation, he is much too soft, by the way, in his judgment of American pursuit of "national interest," and tends to make Churchill-Britain the devil) "and the Chinese want to kill the Japs.—So let's get together and just kill the Japs as fast as we can, and we won't have to worry if we lick the Japs too soon, or defeat Hirohito before we defeat Hitler."

I venture the guess that Lin Yutang is at heart a pacifist—he quotes at length the pacifist utterances of Chinese sages and says: "The leaven of the Sermon on the Mount . . . is the only thing that holds the society of western men tgether whether in the country or the town." But in the face of British imperialism and Japanese aggression he somehow canot hold to Laotse's great word: "Love is victorious in attack and invulnerable in defense. Heaven arms with love those it would not see destroyed." Thus his laughter is turned into weeping and his urbanity into bitterness: "Kill the Japs"; "Nothing can stop China or keep her down." It is inevitable. Men must choose in these days: total war or total pacifism.

A.J.M.

Pro and Con

Pacifism and Fasting

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I wish that any pacifist contemplating a fast could read the article by Gandhi in *Harijan* called "The Fast as Part of Ahimsa." It shows the value of fasting as part of a self-purgation and it should only be used in this spirit. I think that if a fast to coerce is ever valid, it can only be so to force negotiation when all other methods have failed. Perhaps, then, it can be justifiable to bring an issue into free and open discussion, but never should it be used to force a *decision*. If one comes to an impasse, it is not a time for the use of force, but rather a time for self-examination, for either what he is trying to do is wrong, or else he has not brought enough love into the situation to overcome the evil. Either of these faults lie within himself. Hence the need of fasting, self-purgation, and soul-searching.

If it is carried on in this spirit, I think non-violence can never be used for a bad purpose. The purest satyagraha can never be a method of coercion, physical, mental, or moral. The satyagrahi will never allow his acts to force another to do that which the other does not wish to do, for he is always keenly aware of and sensitive to him whom he would overcome by love.

This process is not, however, a mere matter of the "convincing of rightness." For the method doesn't change a man's opinions so much as it changes *the man*. This is why such extreme patience is necessary. It is because we do not fully understand this that we would so often turn to expedients, and in so doing, fail in our primary purpose.

I used to long for a general understanding of Gandhi and his methods by the pacifists of America. Now this longing turns to sadness as I see the technique grow—leaving the spirit behind. Without a soul, it could be a veritable Frankenstein —a danger of immense potency. But, of course, a soul is there. The difficulty is that it is active and aggressive,—it refuses to do this or that evil. So while non-violence is considered a positive phase of pacifism because it is active and aggressive, as practiced here it is pretty much negative in spirit marking its limitations by things it will not do . . . instead of brilliantly radiating its light of love with such positive power that it need not even stop to consider what it should *not* do. It is our job, then, to build this adequate, positive, creative soul into Satyagraha.

LEE STERN

College — 1943

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

A liberal education in the United States today is, for the mental comfort of any thinking person, a little too close to being exactly as G. Herschel Coffin describes it. The college in which I am being inoculated with irrelevant knowledge is filled with people who, although they do not particularly enjoy their unrelated studies, have nevertheless accepted all this as the thing to do, have conformed and submitted to all the stereotyped assumptions that G. H. Coffin has listed. Due to some otherwise acquired intellect, a few students are able to relate, assimilate, and interpret class knowledge to a small degree despite the way it is dealt; most take it as part of the dull but necessary way of acquiring an education, which, giving one a vague knowledge of facts and figures to quote, a polish to impress, and a certain satisfaction to enterprising parents, is of course desirable; a few compensate for other social "lacks" or retain their superior reputations by knowing textbook material cold and achieving honors for it. Whether college students graduate with a certain amount of real education because of or in spite of the system is a matter for debate.

At various times it has been a question in my mind whether to remain in an organization of a potentially beneficial nature to work on it from within, or to withdraw and begin with something more visually solid at the base. In most cases it has worked out that efforts are freer and more effective for action of a more positive nature if they are withdrawn from an organization whose foundation, despite its reformable potentialities, are questionable. In this matter of colleges I have thought for some time to withdraw before long from this "liberal arts" set-up for some evaluation and seeking of a more positive scheme of learning-while-doing education—perhaps now is the time, if G. H. Coffin should feel the need of a pupil for his converted college of liberal arts any time soon.

ANNABELLE MORRISSETT

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

Martyrs and Happiness

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

What is the relationship between happiness and martyrdom? Is the martyr one who denies life, who takes the way of sorrow and pain? Is he one who is steeped in the dusky hues of night? If he is, the word has lost its meaning. The dictionary defines a martyr as "one who testifies by his death to his faith or principles." The martyr is not the denier of life; he is the great affirmer. He affirms even at the cost of his life. Of course he may sacrifice himself in a cause that is less than the best, or that is entirely evil. Martyrdom certainly is not a good in itself, and so is never to be sought as an end in itself. It is a way that is to be taken only by the wisest and the best. And if one has to be a martyr, he ought not only to be sure that the cause is worth the sacrifice, but that the time and place are properly chosen, as Jesus appears to have done. But that mistakes are made by those who become martyrs does not constitute a condemnation of it any more than a mistake in any other activity would constitute a condemnation of the whole field.

To get back to the relationship between martyrdom and happiness, let us consider a few examples. Among all the martyrs none, I think, are more noble or more typical than Jesus and Socrates, and they were among the most joyous of men. During a long conversation Jesus had with his friends right under the shadow of his cross he said: "I have spoken these words unto you that my joy might be in you and that your joy might be made full." One who understood him very well, writing years after his death, said: "For the joy that was set before him he endured the cross, despising the shame." One of the charges brought against Jesus to prove that he was not a true prophet was just that he was too joyous.

Socrates was like him in this. When his young friends came to console him as he was preparing to drink the hemlock, they could not restrain their tears. He chaffed them gently, accusing them, who were strong men, of acting the role of wailing-women. He wanted to know if that were the proper manner in which to speed one on a pleasant journey. Before long they laughed through their tears. When they asked how he wanted to be buried, he replied that they would have to catch him before they could lay him away, and in that he was perfectly serious.

Paul and Silas are two more good examples of those who take the way of martyrdom. Once when their backs were cut to hash with whips and they were chained on a stone floor in prison, they sang songs of praise at midnight. So it would go, all down the roll of the saints. Where would one find a man more happy today than Gandhi as he walks the way of self-denial, or rather of self-giving? Are not such always the radiantly happy souls? Of course, such are also men of sorrow and acquainted with grief. They know what it means to "bear the burden of the World's divine regret," but perhaps for that very reason, they are possessed by the world's deepest joy. If the wail of gloom is sometimes raised by the devotees of self-sacrifice, it has never been heard from the camp of the true martyrs. Theirs has ever been the shout of rejoicing.

ROSS WALDRON ANDERSON

S.J. Res. 84

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

On October 4, Senator Wilson of Iowa introduced a measure (S.J. Res. 84) calling for the "promotion of permanent peace." Since this measure calls for a mixed Executive and Congressional delegation of continuing character, the value of the Fulbright resolution (or of the Senate version of the latter), will depend on the passage also of S.J. Res. 84. Granted that both the Fulbright measure and the dubious brain-child of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are vague, the vital need of a *continuing* committee or commission of Congress to formulate more definite interpretations from time to time as events move ahead, ought to stir us who long for a new world order, to vigorous, consecrated action for S.J. Res. 84.

TRACY D. MYGATT

Would you like to help write the peace?

HAVE YOU ANY FRIENDS?

You think those questions are not related? Listen. The post-war peace is being written today, by the public opinion being developed on it. *You can help mold that public opinion by working with friends and acquaintances.* It's as simple as that!

This is a time of crisis. The next few years may determine the course of history for centuries. For pacifists it must be a time for action. Every one of us has the obligation *now* to engage in definite activities for a better world.

Here are some suggestions for action

WORK ON RACE

Is there racial tension in your community? Stimulate a group of concerned people to locate it and help in its peaceful solution.

Read —

Outcasts! — the evacuation of Japanese-Americans (Foote)	.15
Interracial Primer (Rustin)	.15
New World A'Coming (Ottley)	2.50
Brothers Under the Skin! (McWilliams)	3.00

BOOKS FOR CHRISTMAS

Let your gifts this Christmas carry a real message of peace. Send books and pamphlets. We will ship them for you and enclose gift card with your name. Books ordered from all publishers.

Or a year's subscription to FELLOWSHIP, *at* $1.00 *(regular price* $1.50*) would be an effective gift. Gift card included.*

STUDY POST-WAR PLANS

Post-war plans may be only camouflage for continued power politics and imperialism. Organize a discussion forum to study these plans.

Read —

Comparative Peace Plans	.25
Balance of Power	.25
Coercion of States in Federal Union (Will world police work?)	.25
Shall We Rule Germany?	.10
Pattern for Peacemakers	.25

COUNTERACT MILITARISM AMONG YOUTH

With colleges converted into army and navy training schools, and high schools organized in the Victory Corps, the militarists are having a field day with American young people.

You can combat this by organizing *Forerunners* groups, using Forerunners Studybooks in Sunday school classes and other similar groups, etc. Read the *Leader's Manual* (.15) or, better yet, buy a *Leader's Kit* (.75) containing all materials.

HELP BUILD COOPERATIVES

The FOR Commission on Economics sees consumers cooperatives as the only answer to the economic thralldom of competitive capitalism. If you're not already in the co-ops, join one or help organize a new one.

Read —

A Short Introduction to Consumer Cooperation	.15
Here Is Tomorrow	.10
Cooperation As a Way of Peace	.50

RESIST TOTALITARIANISM

We are in grave danger of surrendering all our freedom to the state, including freedom of religion. Help to educate Americans as to the nature of this threat to all our hopes.

Read —

By all means read *The Fall of Christianity*, a study of Christianity, the State, and War, by G. J. Heering. Just off the press: 250 pages, cloth-bound $1.50

Also, read free materials opposing conscription. Available on request.

WRITE FOR COMPLETE LIST OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Literature Department

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.